

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
9 **FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
10

11 RAMON CONTRERAS,
12 Plaintiff,

13 v.

14 JEFF MACOMBER, et al.,
15 Defendants.
16

No. 2:23-CV-1022-DJC-DMC-P

ORDER

17 Plaintiff, a prisoner proceeding pro se, brings this civil rights action pursuant to
18 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Pending before the Court are: (1) Plaintiff's motion to deem matters admitted,
19 see ECF No. 30; and (2) Defendants' motion for an extension of time to serve responses to
20 discovery requests, see ECF No. 32.

21 In his motion, Plaintiff states that he served requests for admissions on Defendants
22 on December 18, 2024. See ECF No. 30, pg. 1. According to Plaintiff, he attempted to meet and
23 confer with defense counsel Norma Morales, Esq., but that those efforts went unanswered. See
24 id. at 2. According to Plaintiff, as of the date his motion was filed in February 2025, he still had
25 not received any responses to his requests for admissions. See id. at 3.

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 In response to Plaintiff's motion, Defendants filed the pending motion for an
2 extension of time to serve responses to Plaintiff's discovery requests. See ECF No. 32.
3 According to Defendants, a change in defense counsel resulted in excusable neglect with respect
4 to responding to Plaintiff's discovery requests. See id.

5 A review of the docket reflects that, as of March 11, 2024, when Defendants filed
6 their answer in this action, Defendants were represented by Deputy Attorney General Gregory M.
7 Cribbs, Esq. See ECF No. 18. On November 14, 2024, Defendants filed a designation of new
8 counsel substituting Deputy Attorney General Norma Morales, Esq., as counsel. See ECF No.
9 29. On February 28, 2025, Defendants filed a second designation of new counsel substituting
10 Deputy Attorney General Ryan Gille, Esq., as counsel. See ECF No. 31. Given the multiple
11 counsel changes in a relatively short period of time between November 2024 and February 2025,
12 the Court finds good cause to grant Defendants' request for an extension of time to serve
13 discovery responses. In this regard, the Court notes that Plaintiff has filed a motion to compel
14 further response to his requests for admissions served in December 2024, indicating that
15 Defendants have served responses. See ECF No. 36. In this motion, Plaintiff states that
16 discovery responses were served on April 25, 2025. See id. at 5. The Court also notes that, in a
17 separate motion to compel further responses to interrogatories, Plaintiff confirms that Defendants
18 have served responses to his requests for admissions and that he is willing to withdraw his motion
19 at ECF No. 30 as a result. See ECF No. 37, pg. 8.

20 Plaintiff's motions to compel relating to the sufficiency of Defendants' substantive
21 responses to his requests for admissions, interrogatories, and requests for production of
22 documents, which are briefed, will be addressed by separate order. See ECF Nos. 33, 35, 36, and
23 37. Plaintiff states that, as to each of these discovery requests, he received responses from
24 Defendants. See id. Except as to any additional discovery which the Court may order in
25 resolving these motions, discovery in this action is closed. Pending resolution of the remaining
26 discovery motions, the Court will vacate the current dispositive motions filing deadline.

27 ///

28 ///

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED as follows:

1. Defendants' motion for an extension of time to serve responses to Plaintiff's discovery requests, ECF No. 32, is granted, and Defendants' responses to Plaintiff's requests for admissions, interrogatories, and requests for production of documents are deemed timely.
2. Plaintiff's motion to deem matters admitted, ECF No. 30, is denied as moot.
3. The dispositive motion filing deadline is vacated pending further order of the Court.

Dated: August 12, 2025



DENNIS M. COTA
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE